

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-17 and 19-28 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 1-7, 9-22 and 24-28 presently stand rejected. Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 12, 13, 16, 19 and 25 are amended herein. Claims 3, 11 and 18 are cancelled. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

The Examiner is thanked for the indication in the February 19, 2008 Office Action that claims 8 and 23 contain allowable subject matter. No changes to claim 23 have been made by way of this amendment. Claim 8 has been amended to change “data blocks” to “trie blocks.” Applicants respectfully submit that these claims remain allowable for the same reasons they were allowable in the previous office action, in addition to the reasons provided below in support of independent claim 1.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 25 and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kumar (US 2004/0028040). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Amended claim 1 now recites in pertinent part,

deriving a pool index associated with the portion of the destination address to **identify a pool of trie blocks from among a plurality of pools of trie blocks located in a same memory unit**, wherein each trie block comprises a plurality of trie entries, **each trie entry comprising a next-hop pointer and a next-trie pointer to reference**

**trie entries located in the pool of trie blocks including the next-hop pointer and the next-trie pointer;**

Emphasis added. Applicants respectfully submit that Kumar fails to disclose identifying a pool of trie blocks from a plurality of pools of trie blocks and wherein the next-hop pointer and the next-trie pointer reference trie entries located in the same pool of trie blocks that includes the next-hop pointer and the next-trie pointer.

Kumar in paragraphs 31-32 as cited by the Examiner simply teaches a trie data structure 500 including seven trie tables wherein an entry in each trie table points to an entry in another of the trie tables *within* structure 500. In rejecting claim 25, the Examiner cites trie data structure 500 as the claimed pool of trie blocks. *Office Action* mailed 2/19/2008, line 8, page 4. Assuming this characterization to be true, although Applicants do not concede that is, Kumar does not teach identifying a pool of trie blocks from a plurality of pools of trie blocks because Kumar does not teach identifying a trie data structure 500 from a plurality of trie data structures 500. The Examiner is directed to Figures 7 and 8 and the accompanying description on pages 14 and 15 for a discussion related to the above limitation. Deriving the pool index to identify **a pool of trie blocks from among a plurality of pools of trie blocks** dramatically increases the number of available trie blocks such as for example up to 32,000 – 64,000 trie blocks as shown in Figures 7 and 8.

Consequently, Kumar fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Independent claims 10 and 25 include similar novel elements as independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the instant §102 rejections of claims 1, 10 and 25 is requested.

Dependent claims 2-5, 1-12 and 27-28 are novel over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own.

Applicants note that dependent claim 6 as presently amended recites the limitation of deriving the pool index comprising reading the pool index associated with the portion of the destination address from the entry in the table wherein the pool index is a separate field in addition to a next-hop pointer and next trie pointer in the entry in the table. Applicants submit Kumar also fails to disclose or teach this limitation.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant §102 rejections of dependent claim 6 and the remaining dependent claims be withdrawn.

*Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claims 7, 9, 13-22, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over different combinations of Kumar, Du (US 5,694,591), Mathew (US 2004/0006639) and Choe (US 2002/0118682).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. As to claims 7, 9 and 26, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claims 1 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that claims 7, 9 and 26 are therefore allowable by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

As to independent claims 13 and 16, Applicants also respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. "To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Amended independent claim 13 recites in pertinent part "deriving a pool index associated with the portion of the destination address to identify a pool of trie blocks from among a plurality of pools of trie blocks located in a same memory unit, wherein each trie block comprises a plurality of trie entries, each trie entry comprising a next-hop pointer and a next-trie pointer to reference trie entries located in the pool of trie blocks including the next-hop pointer and the next-trie pointer."

As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Kumar fails to teach, disclose or suggest deriving a pool index associated with the portion of the destination address to identify a pool of trie blocks from among a plurality of pools of trie blocks in a same memory unit, wherein each trie block comprises a plurality of trie entries, each trie entry comprising a next-hop pointer and a next-trie pointer to reference trie entries located in

the pool of trie blocks including the next-hop pointer and the next-trie pointer. Furthermore, Du, Mathew and Choe whether taken singularly or in combination, also fail to disclose, teach, or fairly suggest at least one of the expressly recited limitations of claim 13, in particular, “deriving a pool index associated with the portion of the destination address to identify a pool of trie blocks from among a plurality of pools of trie blocks located in a same memory unit, wherein each trie block comprises a plurality of trie entries, each trie entry comprising a next-hop pointer and a next-trie pointer to reference trie entries located in the pool of trie blocks including the next-hop pointer and the next-trie pointer;” Accordingly, claim 13 is not rendered obvious by the cited references. Independent claim 16 distinguishes from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 13. Therefore Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

#### *Dependent Claims*

Dependent claims 14, 15, 17-22 and 24 are novel and nonobvious over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant §103 rejections of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.


### CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: April 18, 2008



Linda S. Huang Zachariah

Reg. No. 48, 057

Phone: (206) 292-8600

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040